DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 582 UD 015 410

AUTHOR	Featherman, David L.; Hauser, Robert M.
TITLE	Sexual Inequalities and Socioeconomic Achievement in the U.S., 1962-1973.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Inst. for Research on Poverty.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. RANN Program.; Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	IRP-DP-275-75
PUB DATE	Jun 75
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Achievement Gains; Civil Rights; *Employment Opportunities; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Equal Protection; Family Background; Income; Occupational Mobility; *Sex Differences; *Sex Discrimination; *Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS	Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey; Socioeconomic Achievement

ABSTRACT

This paper on sexual inequalities and socioeconomic achievement in the U.S. addresses the question of change in the processes of socioeconomic allocation for men and women during the period 1962-73. Data comparing married spouse-present men and their wives are drawn from an analysis of the 1962 socioeconomic stratification study, "Occupational Changes in a Generation," and its subsequent 1975 replication. An examination of occupation, education, and earnings showed socioeconomic improvements for both men and women. Women were found to have attained more schooling, but their achievements appeared less associated with the circumstances of their families or origin than did those of men. Although little evidence of inequality of opportunity by sex for educational and occupational attainments between 1962 and 1973 was found, equality of economic opportunity for women did not follow this pattern, as the process of earning attainment was found to be sharply different for the sexes, with men deriving greater benefits from family origins, education, and occupational standing. Earning returns to education were larger for both sexes. The notion of a declining socioeconomic importance of schooling was not supported by the data. These increases in the occupational and economic returns to schooling are said to support the notion that change is in the direction of the meritocracy, while the relative bearing of education versus family factors is said to be shifting to universalism. (Author/AM)

ED110582

SEXUAL INEQUALITIES AND SOCIOECONOMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN THE U.S., 1962-1973

David L. Featherman

Robert M. Hauser

June 1975

This work has been supported by grants from NSF-RANN (GI-44336), NICHHD (HD-05876), and institutional support from the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and by the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with funds granted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The authors thank Peter Dickinson, Neil Fligstein, David Dickens, Michael Sobel, and Molly Kowalczyk for their assistance in producing these statistics. The opinions expressed are those of the author.

UD 015410

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

Intercohort shifts in mean education, occupational status, and earnings for married persons in the experienced civilian labor forces of 1962 and 1973 represent socioeconomic improvements for both men and women. While the occupational and educational achievements of women have kept pace with men's and indeed exceed the male means, the ratio of female to male earnings has declined from 0.39 to 0.38 for husbands and wives in the ECLF. On rather rudimentary causal models of the processes of socioeconomic achievement, men and women are allocated to levels of education and occupational status in much the same manner. Women's achievements are somewhat less related to the characteristics of their families of origin, especially farm origin, than are men's attainments, and the net effect of educational attainment on occupational status is larger for wives than for their husbands. Intercohort changes in the process of occupational achieve- have affected both sexes and include an increase in the net occupational status benefit of an additional year of schooling and a decline in the occupational handicap of farm origins.

Equality of economic opportunity for women had not followed from women's opportunities for schooling and occupational status. The process of earnings attainment is sharply different for the sexes, with men deriving greater benefits from their family origins, educations, and occupational standings, even among persons of statistically equivalent work experience and levels of current labor force participation. While the net returns of education have improved more noticeably for women than men between 1962 and 1973, the intertemporal

increases in returns to occupational status have benefitted only men. In both decades, had women enjoyed the same rates of return as men to their stocks of human capital, the sexual gap in earnings would not have been reduced appreciably, since the differential reflects "discrimination" more than the compositional differences between the sexes. Discrimination accounts for 85 percent of the earnings gap in 1962 and 84 percent in 1973. Despite these inequalities, the process of economic attainment is even less tied to persons' social backgrounds (especially farm origins) in 1973 than a decade earlier, and the earnings returns to education are larger for both sexes. We find no support for popular notions of a declining socioeconomic importance of schooling.

These results reflect interim analyses of the 1962 and 1973 replicates of the "Occupational Changes in a Generation" survey, carried out in supplement to the March Current Population Surveys in those years.

SEXUAL INEQUALITIES AND SOCIOECONOMIC ACHIEVEMENT
IN THE U.S., 1962-1973

Introduction

During this International Women's Year it is fitting that students of social mobility and socioeconomic inequality intensify the scientific analysis of trends in inequality by gender and of the probable factors associated with differential allocation of men and women to statuses within the distributions of formal schooling, of occupation, and of earnings. Systematic research into the processes of socioeconomic allocation--commonly known as "status attainment" processes (Haller and Portes, 1973)--is extensive for males in the civilian noninstitutional population. During the last decade increasing attention to comparative processes of (socioeconomic) status allocation by gender has followed the rising popular awareness of the extensive involvements of women in the labor force, of the independent contributions of married females to their family's socioeconomic position and prestige (Nilson, 1974; Rossi, Sampson, Bose, Jasso, and Passel, 1974), of the influence of a revitalized women's political movement, and of data appropriate to broad-scale sexual comparisons.

Most recently, the sociological literature has focused upon intergenerational mobility differentials for men and women (DeJong, Brawer, and Robin, 1971; Havens and Tully, 1972; Rogoff, 1973; Tyree and Treas, 1974; Featherman and Hauser, 1974; Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan, 1974). Discounting work flawed by technical artifacts and

inappropriate data, the weight of evidence indicates that women with occupations in the regular labor force do experience different mechanisms of allocation to their statuses of destination from their families of origin than do men (Tyree and Treas, 1974). One major difference is the lesser likelihood of occupational inheritance for women of both races than for men (Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan, 1974). When one considers the occupational roles of women outside the regular labor force as well as those within it, these social mechanisms of intergenerational transfer become even more differentiated by sex within each race; and, although there appears to have been some diminution of the sexual inequities in opportunity for intergenerational mobility since the early 1960s (Featherman and Hauser, 1974), the level of occupational inequality has not decreased by much. In fact, we have suggested elsewhere (Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan, 1974) that the degree and persistence of sexual inequality in mobility processes, as manifest in data on intergenerational occupational relationships, are more intransigent than racial ones; efforts to ameliorate these inequities may be more complicated and problematic than providing equity in the mobility regimes to which whites and blacks of either sex are subject.

In any event, a detailed analysis of the comparative processes whereby the socioeconomic statuses of adult women and men are related to those of their parents is warranted, as is the study of change in these processes. Cross-sectional studies for the mid-1960s are just now being disseminated (Carter, 1972; Wang, 1973; Treiman and Terrell, 1975). The findings, although open to equivocal interpretation,

suggest that men and women face rather similar basic processes of attainment vis-à-vis schooling and occupational status subsequent to the completion of education. Indeed, as measured by means and variances, the educational and the occupaticnal socioeconomic status (Duncan, 1961) distributions of both sexes are virtually identical in demographically equivalent groups (Treiman and Terrell, 1975). Moreover, the role of socioeconomic background in educational attainment and of both in occupational achievement appear to be generally the same for each gender. However, more fine-grained studies, in which social psychological factors such as intellective ability, aspirations, school performance, and influences of significant reference persons are included in causal models, show small but significant sex differences (for example, Carter, 1972; Alexander and Eckland, 1974). For example, the friends of adolescent females are less influential in the later attainment of these women than are the adolescent friends of males, while girls' parents provide greater inducements for achievement-related aspirations and higher education than do boys' parents. In addition, mechanisms of sex modeling are implied by data showing a somewhat larger influence of maternal education than paternal education on the school achievement of young women, while the converse pattern appears for young men.

If there are similar allocative mechanisms that apply to the educational and occupational achievements of comparable groups of men and women, those that stratify them by earnings are in few ways similar (Suter and Miller, 1973; Treiman and Terrell, 1975). Even among demographically equivalent groups of full-time, full-year workers,

women enjoy lesser earnings per unit of schooling within comparable occupational status categories and, among persons of equal education, lower labor income for the same occupational status. Some have interpreted these differentials as indicating sexual discrimination, while others have suggested that women experience greater deterioration and obsolescence of their human capital than do men, through discontinuous labor force participation (especially among married women) and fewer postschooling investments (cf. U.S. Department of Labor [Parnes], 1970; Mincer and Polachek, 1974). Doubtless both factors are at work and probably are interrelated.

This paper addresses the question of change in the processes of socioeconomic allocation for men and women in the U.S. during the period 1962-1973. These years were marked by well-publicized efforts to address unequal opportunities, although the reference for those programs was largely racial rather than sexual. In no way do we claim that our analysis will evaluate the effectiveness of these programs. Rather, we think our work sets in perspective the kinds of change in some fundamental social processes that have transpired over a little more than a decade; moreover, it provides a background against which current and future efforts to alter sexual differentials in status can be gauged.

Data

Data are drawn from the 1962 benchmark study of socioeconomic stratification, "Occupational Changes in a Generation (OCG)," carried

out by Otis Dudley Duncan and Peter M. Blau (Blau and Duncan, 1967) and from the 1973 replicate of this work (Featherman and Hauser, 1975). While the target population for both these researches is the civilian noninstitutionalized population of males in the prime work years, replicate information on selected variables is available in each to carry out a comparison of married spouse-present men and their wives. In both 1962 and 1973, the OCG surveys were adjunct to the March Current Population Surveys; consequently, data for husbands' and wives' educations, occupations, earnings, and recent labor force experiences are obtained from those sources. Supplementary questionnaires to the target males in 1962 and 1973 elicited information on characteristics of their families of origin--namely, for our present purposes, father's (head of family) occupation around the son's sixteenth birthday and number of siblings. Each currently married OCG man enumerated his wife on her father's (head of family) occupation around her sixteenth birthday and the size of her sibship. These items exhaust the extent of replicate information on men's and women's families contained in both surveys.

Data on all occupation variables are transformed into Duncan's (1961) index of socioeconomic status (SEI). In the cases of father's occupation, these recodes are based on three-digit Census detailed occupation and industry codes and class of worker; current occupation SEI scores are calculated for a forty-category, two-digit "detailed" occupation classification, owing to the limitations of the 1962 detail for women.[1] Husbands and/or wives whose fathers were engaged in farm occupations are differentiated by a score of "1" on a

dichotomy in order to represent the unique effects of this social context and to overcome some of the ambiguity associated with the SEI score for the status of farm titles. Education represents single years completed, and earnings are expressed in constant 1972 dollars of annual salaries, wages, and self-employment income for the years 1961 and 1972. Years of work experience are estimated by the difference, age minus years of completed schooling, minus a constant, 6. For most men this is a usable proxy for increments to "human capital" via on-the-job training over the work career, assuming constant annual discount and investment rates. On the other hand, the discontinuities in female labor force attachments undoubtedly vitiate the validity of this indicator for women's experience; we are, nonetheless, left no alternative in this paper, bound as we are to comparable, replicate items. To represent the decay or deterioration of human capital as a function of age (owing to declining health, physical and mental capacities, and the disincentives to retrain at older ages), we construct the square of our experience proxy. (See Mincer, 1974, for a theoretic rationale for these latter two constructions.) Again, we are aware of the limitations of this proxy for the circumstances of our female cases. Finally, we create an indicator for time or hours at work in the year prior to the respective surveys by multiplying the hours worked in the week before the survey date by the weeks worked in the prior year. Clearly this is a crude measure, but one with currency in the economic literature on earnings differentials (Fuchs, 1967).

Perforce our findings pertain only to married spouse-present men and women. In addition, we have restricted our analysis of occupational status and earnings to persons in the experienced civilian labor force (ECLF). In 1962 our 14,990 sample observations for men and 5594 for women represent, respectively, 32.6 million and 12.2 million cases in the ECLF population aged 20-64. In 1973, the 23,591 men and 11,956 women aged 20-64 represent ECLF populations of 37.2 million and 18.8 million, respectively.

Findings

For both men and women, the period 1962-1973 represented an improvement in the conditions for upward socioeconomic mobility lodged in the family of orientation and of the statuses attained (cf. means and standard deviations of variables in Tables 1 and 2). Persons aged 20-64 in 1973 are more likely to have been reared in smaller, higher status families than the cohort aged 20-64 in 1962. They typically are better educated, hold occupations of higher socioeconomic standing, and earn more income (in constant dollars). In neither period, however, are men and women in the ECLF of equal status across all variables. With respect to the family factors that we can examine, men and women are rather comparable, except for small differences in sibship size (women are reared with slightly fewer siblings); the ratio of female to male means on these family variables is rather constant around 1.00 between 1962 and 1973. Likewise, men and women in the ECLF attained approximately equivalent years of formal

TABLE 1

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION AMONG INDICATORS OF SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND AND ATTAINMENTS, MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN (ABOVE DIAGONAL) AND WOMEN (BELOW DIAGONAL) AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1962

Variables		Variables										
		FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY	EARN	$\bar{M}$	S.D.
Father's Occ SEI	FAOCC	-	-.437	-.289	.427	.373	.053	-.177	-.171	.280	27.59	21.08
Farm origin	FARM	-.419	-	.263	-.317	-.267	.045	.228	.224	-.213	0.30	0.46
Sibship size	SIBS	-.272	.248	-	-.350	-.253	-.039	.221	.215	-.182	4.18	2.76
Education	EDUC	.336	-.187	-.269	-	.569	.145	-.487	-.496	.380	10.82	3.46
Occupation SEI	OCC	.311	-.198	-.240	.584	-	.132	-.170	-.170	.396	37.88	22.52
Hours worked, 1961	TIME	-.009	.058	.001	.025	.119	-	-.049	-.064	.178	2189.22	749.60
Experience	EXPER	-.134	.162	.196	-.401	-.184	.070	-	.971	-.094	25.30	12.32
Decay	DECAY	-.117	.149	.179	-.420	-.179	.062	.963	-	-.124	791.93	667.03
Earnings, 1961[a]	EARN	.129	-.119	-.061	.221	.323	.379	-.022	-.042	-	7921.01	5698.95
	$\bar{M}$	27.09	0.30	3.96	11.27	38.86	1437.06	22.80	646.99	3106.45		
	S.D.	20.97	0.46	2.70	2.90	21.43	829.46	11.27	535.50	3428.18		

Source: Occupational Changes in a Generation-I Survey

[a]Earnings inflated to 1972 dollars.

TABLE 2

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION AMONG INDICATORS OF SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND AND ATTAINMENTS, MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN (ABOVE DIAGONAL) AND WOMEN (BELOW DIAGONAL) AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1973

Variables		Variables										
		FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY	EARN	$\bar{M}$	S.D.
Father's Occ SEI	FAOCC	-	-.412	-.289	.416	.346	.017	-.212	-.199	.215	29.23	22.32
Farm origin	FARM	-.417	-	.265	-.312	-.232	.023	.244	.247	-.141	0.24	0.43
Sibship size	SIBS	-.276	.261	-	-.360	-.251	-.053	.204	.205	-.162	3.78	2.68
Education	EDUC	.375	-.210	-.289	-	.564	.105	-.433	-.449	.337	11.91	3.12
Occupation SEI	OCC	.303	-.182	-.244	.569	-	.112	-.144	-.159	.360	40.71	23.43
Hours worked, 1972	TIME	-.039	.045	.010	.069	.136	-	-.000	-.033	.190	2198.69	708.28
Experience	EXPER	-.224	.234	.159	-.378	-.196	.087	-	.968	.017	23.25	12.69
Decay	DECAY	-.198	.225	.152	-.376	-.178	.090	.963	-	-.034	701.68	638.71
Earnings, 1972	EARN	.095	-.053	-.072	.275	.338	.550	.012	.008	-	11161.87	7948.47
	$\bar{M}$	30.12	0.23	3.64	12.09	41.58	1484.04	20.25	557.16	4219.66		
	S.D.	22.64	0.42	2.61	2.47	21.40	792.41	12.13	536.90	3539.35		

Source: Occupational Changes in a Generation-II Survey.

schooling and levels of occupational socioeconomic status. Again the female-to-male ratios hardly change, over the period, save for a trivially small decline in the educational and occupational advantages of women. [Treiman and Terrell, 1975, document these relative advantages of women for the midsixties.] The largest inequity in each year is the ratio of female to male earnings, which is 0.39 in 1962 and 0.38 in 1973. While the relative relationship remains rather constant, the absolute (constant) dollar gap increases almost 65 percent over the 1962 differential ($6942 versus $4815 difference). (We do not comment here on shifts and differentials in the means of EXPERIENCE and DECAY, as these reflect, in the main, changes in average education and small alterations in the age composition of the ECLF.) To our surprise the ratios for time at work do not change appreciably, although women in the ECLF spend only about 64 percent to 67 percent as many hours at work as do men.

Before leaving the summary statistics for the multivariate analyses, it is interesting to note that in both 1962 and 1973, the product-moment correlations among the variables are almost uniformly higher for men than for women in the ECLF, except for the correlation between education and occupation and for those involving time (hours) in the labor force in the year prior to each survey. Coupled with the generally smaller standard deviations for females than for males this pattern of correlations implies less crystallization of statuses for women. Additionally, they denote a lower order of status inequality (that is, less variability in any female status) and looser allocative linkages between family background and adult statuses.

Education

While married women in 1962 and 1973 attain as much as or more schooling than do their spouses, the relationships among the three family background characteristics and schooling (Tables 3 and 4) are similar but not identical for the sexes. The patterns of relative influences (as estimated by the standardized net regression coefficients) within each sex are the same in both years: paternal socioeconomic status accounts for about 1/4 to 1/3 of a standard deviation of schooling, while number of siblings accounts for about 1/5 of a standard deviation, and farm origin, rougly 1/10 or less. Yet, the raw regression coefficients (based on ordinary least-square estimates) indicate that, in both years, farm origin weighs more heavily on the schooling of men than of women.[2] For both sexes, having a father in farming reduces one's eventual educational attainments, but men incur about a 0.6-0.7 year larger handicap than do women. This sex differential shows no abatement over the interval of inquiry.

The bearing of farm origins on the schooling of men and women is less substantial for persons in the experienced civilian labor forces (ECLF) of both years than for the more extensive population of spouse-present husbands and wives. Since the proportion of married men in the ECLF is larger than that of women, we are not surprised that farm origin is substantially less of a differential handicap for women in the ECLF vis-à-vis total married women than for the same two groups of men (compare upper and lower panels of metric coefficients in each of Tables 3 and 4). Women in the ECLF have attained about 1/3 year more schooling than have the total set of married women.

TABLE 3

FAMILY EFFECTS ON EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 BY LABOR FORCE EXPERIENCE, MARCH 1962

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a] FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	α	R^2
	Metric Coefficients[b]				
Married, spouse-present civilians					
Male education	0.051 (.002)	-0.953 (.071)	-0.292 (.011)	10.867	.253
Female education	0.036 (.002)	-0.382 (.103)	-0.216 (.016)	10.898	.170
Married, spouse-present persons in ECLF					
Male education	0.050 (.001)	-0.927 (.071)	-0.287 (.011)	10.905	.250
Female education	0.038 (.002)	-0.162 (.104)	-0.202 (.016)	11.096	.147
	Standardized Coefficients				
Married spouse-present civilians					
Male education	.307	-.125	-.231		
Female education	.269	-.059	-.205		
Married spouse-present persons in ECLF					
Male education	.307	-.123	-.229		
Female education	.273	-.025	-.188		

Source: Table 1

[a]Variables defined in Table 1.

[b]Standard errors in parentheses.

TABLE 4

FAMILY EFFECTS ON EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 BY LABOR FORCE EXPERIENCE, MARCH 1973

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a]			α	R^2
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS		
	Metric Coefficients[b]				
Married spouse-present civilian					
Male education	0.042 (.001)	-0.996 (.048)	-0.291 (.007)	11.935	.255
Female education	0.036 (.001)	-0.343 (.061)	-0.214 (.009)	11.502	.202
Married spouse-present persons in ECLF					
Male education	0.041 (.001)	-0.922 (.047)	-0.282 (.007)	11.995	.249
Female education	0.034 (.001)	-0.175 (.058)	-0.186 (.009)	11.791	.179
	Standardized Coefficients				
Married spouse-present civilian					
Male education	.293	-.134	-.245		
Female education	.309	-.054	-.216		
Married spouse-present persons in ECLF					
Male education	.294	-.126	-.241		
Female education	.308	-.030	-.196		

Source: Table 2

[a] Variables defined in Table 2.

[b] Standard errors in parentheses.

Selection into the ECLF is a probable explanation for the weaker linkage between farm background and education; in fact, the combined effects of the three family regressors account for less variance for both ECLF men and women in both years than for total married spouses. (But the block of family factors explains between 5 percent and 7 percent less of the variance in female's than in male's schooling.) In that sense, one might conclude that there is more equality of educational opportunity for persons (but especially women) who subsequently enter the ECLF than for the general population of married persons.

We are reluctant to commit ourselves to any single interpretation of the sex differential in the effects of sibship size and farm origins on schooling, given the few comparable measurements on family factors at our disposal. The absence of paternal and maternal education from these equations is noteworthy, as (lower) parental education does account for some of the educational handicaps of persons from farm origins (Blau and Duncan, 1967: 286-292), and maternal and paternal education apparently influences the schooling of girls and boys differently (Sewell and Shah, 1968). However, we are inclined to view the interaction of farm origins and sex as reflecting the greater occupational or career influence of farming on (farm) boys, who tend to aspire to less schooling and to occupations with a lower mean SEI score (including farming), and who have lower academic ability than their nonfarm male peers (Haller and Wolff, 1962; Haller and Sewell, 1967; Sewell, Haller, and Ohlendorf, 1970).

In summary, there appears to be no less and perhaps more educational opportunity for married women than for their husbands, especially for women in the ECLF. Not only do women attain more schooling, but their achievements appear less associated with the circumstances of their families of origin (as reflected in the limited family factors we could consider) than do those of men. There is no evidence of change in sexual equality of educational opportunity between 1962 and 1973. [We note that equal mean education does not necessarily imply equal opportunity. Had we measures of grade point average, I.Q., and achievement aspirations, for example, it is possible that the sometimes more advantageous mean levels of these causal antecedents for females, when applied to the males' regression coefficients, might predict an expected level of education higher than both the observed male and female means (Carter, 1972). Marriage and family building factors may also serve to depress the female mean, relative to its expectation in the absence of those constraints. That eventuality would argue that females experience an educational handicap that is not observable in the comparison of education means nor in the "reduced-form" of that hypothetical equation that we have estimated here.]

Occupation

The process whereby husbands and wives in the ECLF are allocated to socioeconomic levels of the occupation structure has changed, but not dramatically between 1962 and 1973, and it manifests a few,

if substantively minor, sex differentials. Women's family backgrounds are 3 percent to 5 percent less influential than men's in determining variation in occupational status (compare in the upper panels of metric coefficients, lines 1a and 1b, in Tables 5 and 6). While farm origins depresses achievement slightly more for men than women in both years, this characteristic is relatively less important than the other two family factors for both sexes (cf. equations 3a and 3b in Tables 5 and 6). Paternal occupational status, sibship size, and farm origins are essentially indirect causal antecedents of occupational status, by virtue of their connection with schooling (compare the coefficients for these family factors in equations 1a and 1b with those in 2a and 2b in Tables 5 and 6). All three family factors do retain a substantively trivial though statistically significant direct effect for both sexes in both years, controlling for education. However, most (52 percent to 78 percent) of the effects of father's occupation and sibship size on filial occupation is indirect through schooling.

One change in the process of occupational attainment for both sexes concerns the role of farm origins, whose negative causal effect on schooling declines 14 percent for men and 28 percent for women (cf. equations 1a and 1b in Tables 5 and 6). With education controlled, the intertemporal reductions of the farm handicap are 50 percent and 43 percent, or roughly one point on the SEI scale.

Education increments R^2 about 18 percent to 19 percent for men and 22 percent to 24 percent for women, and schooling has the largest absolute and relative effects on occupational status. In light of our previous discussion of the educational handicap of farm origins,

TABLE 5

FAMILY AND SCHOOLING EFFECTS ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1962

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a] FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	α	R^2
			Metric Coefficients[b]			
1a. Male occupation SEI	0.306 (.011)	-5.146 (.487)	-1.164 (.076)		35.847	.171
1b. Female occupation SEI	0.249 (.017)	-2.645 (.775)	-1.266 (.124)		37.918	.125
2a. Male occupation SEI	0.147 (.010)	-2.219 (.435)	-0.257 (.069)	3.156 (.059)	1.429	.347
2b. Female occupation SEI	0.102 (.015)	-2.015 (.662)	-0.481 (.108)	3.885 (.101)	-5.188	.361
			Standardized Coefficients			
3a. Male occupation SEI	.286	-.105	-.142			
3b. Female occupation SEI	.244	-.056	-.160			
4a. Male occupation SEI	.137	-.045	-.031	.485		
4b. Female occcupation SEI	.100	-.043	-.061	.526		

Source: Table 1

[a]Variables defined in Table 1.

[b]Standard errors in parentheses.

TABLE 6

FAMILY AND SCHOOLING EFFECTS ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1973

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variable[a]				α	R^2
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC		
			Metric Coefficients[b]			
1a. Male occupation SEI	0.281	-4.441	-1.331		38.585	.150
	(.007)	(.379)	(.058)			
1b. Female occupation SEI	0.227	-1.913	-1.378		40.197	.121
	(.010)	(.516)	(.079)			
2a. Male occupation SEI	0.129	-1.012	-.284	3.721	-6.043	.335
	(.007)	(.338)	(.053)	(.048)		
2b. Female occupation SEI	0.077	-1.139	-0.551	4.443	-12.191	.338
	(.009)	(.448)	(.070)	(.076)		
			Standardized Coefficients			
3a. Male occupation SEI	.269	-.081	-.152			
3b. Female occupation SEI	.241	-.038	-.168			
4a. Male occupation SEI	.123	-.019	-.032	.496		
4b. Female occupation SEI	.082	-.022	-.067	.514		

Source: Table 2

[a]Variables defined in Table 2.

[b]Standard errors in parentheses.

especially among men in the ECLF, we are not surprised that between one-half to three-quarters of the causal effect of farm origins on occupation is indirect through schooling. (The figures are 24 percent to 41 percent for women.) But if the role of education as mediator of family factors in occupational achievement is somewhat larger for men than for women, the direct return to schooling is slightly greater for women. In both years, wives in the ECLF enjoy about 0.7 SEI point greater returns to their schooling than do their husbands.

While preserving the sex differential, the metric effect of education on occupation increased about 14 percent (about 0.6 SEI point) for both men and women between 1962 and 1973. This is not a dramatic change in the process of occupational achievement, but it gives no support to those who contend that education is "less important" today than in the past (cf. Task Force to the Secretary of HEW, 1974). At the same time, the linear (multivariate) relationship between family factors, education, and occupational status is slightly lower in 1973 (R^2 = .34) than in 1962 (R^2 = .35 - .36) for both sexes, as the effects of family factors have declined (compare R^2 in equations 1a and 1b in Table 4 with corresponding values in Table 5).

We find little evidence of sexual inequality of opportunity for socioeconomic attainment in the occupational pursuits of spouses in the ECLF. If anything, women's family backgrounds are less effective than men's in affecting the occupational level of current job, and education is perhaps somewhat more influential in the case of women.

Moreover, as reported earlier, women's educational achievements are more loosely linked to their family origins. These facts, coupled with virtual parity in the means and standard deviations[3] of men's and women's occupational SEI, lead us to suggest that, at least in these models of status allocation, women in the ECLF enjoy more socioeconomic opportunity than do men. [We refer the reader to our caveat in brackets at the end of the education section; it applies here as well. The reader hardly needs to be reminded that these conditional conclusions pertain only to married women and men in the ECLF. Earlier work (Featherman and Hauser, 1974; Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan, 1974) has shown the fundamental inequality of opportunity between the sexes when one expands the reference to encompass spouses outside the ECLF and includes roles outside as well as inside the regular labor force (such as housewife). At the same time, there is some evidence that age at marriage, family size, and age composition of children do not affect the occupational achievements of ever-married women who have worked (Sheehy, 1975).]

Earnings

While we had expected little evidence of inequality of opportunity by sex for educational and occupational attainments, earlier research did suggest that, at least for the 1960s, there should be rather substantial earnings differentials and dissimilarities in the processes whereby they arise. For both 1962 and 1973 we observe sex interactions with nearly all of the regressors in our full and reduced-form models for variations in earnings (see Tables 7 and 8). Moreover, the changes in the earnings functions for the 1962-1973 period have

TABLE 7

FAMILY, SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, AND LABOR EXPERIENCE EFFECTS ON EARNINGS, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1962

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a]								α	R^2
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY		
	Metric Coefficients[b]									
1a. Male earnings[c]	56.71	-1200.17	-197.33						7540.24	.097
	(2.82)	(128.57)	(20.07)							
1b. Female earnings	15.21	-570.64	-21.14						2947.62	.022
	(2.87)	(131.04)	(20.90)							
2a. Male earnings	31.66	-739.15	-54.43	497.14					2118.82	.165
	(2.84)	(124.60)	(19.89)	(16.80)						
2b. Female earnings	6.21	-532.11	26.90	237.62					310.90	.057
	(2.92)	(128.76)	(20.91)	(19.70)						
3a. Male earnings	22.69	-603.51	-38.74	304.24	61.12				2031.49	.203
	(2.80)	(121.88)	(19.44)	(18.50)	(2.70)					
3b. Female earnings	1.49	-438.81	49.16	57.78	46.29				551.06	.110
	(2.85)	(125.22)	(20.36)	(22.39)	(2.99)					
4a. Male earnings	22.12	-775.55	-39.04	279.09	58.56	0.92			464.56	.203
	(2.92)	(127.93)	(20.30)	(19.41)	(2.83)	(0.07)				
4b. Female earnings	2.12	-639.98	46.88	80.94	36.59	1.47			-1390.45	.233
	(2.85)	(125.44)	(20.35)	(22.40)	(3.02)	(0.06)				
5a. Male earnings	22.01	-873.58	-55.38	331.56	56.27	0.87	235.05	-3.74	-2798.32	.234
	(2.90)	(127.35)	(20.13)	(21.57)	(2.83)	(0.07)	(17.30)	(0.32)		
5b. Female earnings	2.59	-665.12	39.03	82.67	36.97	1.45	77.69	-1.47	-2196.54	.238
	(2.85)	(125.60)	(20.40)	(24.19)	(3.02)	(0.06)	(17.09)	(0.36)		

(continued)

TABLE 7 (continued)

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a]									
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY	α	R^2
	Standardized Coefficients									
6a. Male earnings	.210	-.096	-.095							
6b. Female earnings	.093	-.076	-.017							
7a. Male earnings	.117	-.059	-.026	.302						
7b. Female earnings	.038	-.070	.021	.201						
8a. Male earnings	.084	-.049	-.019	.185	.241					
8b. Female earnings	.009	-.058	.039	.049	.289					
9a. Male earnings	.082	-.062	-.019	.169	.231	.120				
9b. Female earnings	.013	-.085	.037	.068	.229	.355				
10a. Male earnings	.081	-.070	-.027	.201	.222	.114	.508	-.437		
10b. Female earnings	.016	-.089	.031	.070	.231	.351	.255	-.230		

[a]Variables defined in Table 1.

[b]Standard errors in parentheses.

[c]Earnings in 1961 inflated to 1972 dollars.

TABLE 8

FAMILY, SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, AND LABOR EXPERIENCE EFFECTS ON EARNINGS, ORDINARY LEAST-SQUARES ESTIMATES FOR MARRIED SPOUSE-PRESENT MEN AND WOMEN AGED 20-64 IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, MARCH 1973

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a]								α	R^2
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY		
	Metric Coefficients[b]									
1a. Male earnings[c]	58.44	-853.40	-303.05						10806.75	.058
		(135.40)	(20.63)							
1b. Female earnings	12.28	-69.33	-64.93						4102.26	.011
	(1.70)	(90.46)	(13.87)							
2a. Male earnings	28.18	-174.46	-95.58	736.67					1970.60	.121
	(2.64)	(131.92)	(20.61)	(18.61)						
2b. Female earnings	-1.22	0.59	9.56	400.21					-616.76	.076
	(1.71)	(87.51)	(13.69)	(14.76)						
3a. Male earnings	17.73	-92.51	-72.63	435.39	80.97				2459.93	.159
	(2.61)	(129.07)	(20.17)	(20.58)	(2.58)					
3b. Female earnings	-4.76	52.63	34.73	197.17	45.70				-59.64	.126
	(1.67)	(85.11)	(13.35)	(16.54)	(1.85)					
4a. Male earnings	19.13	-263.29	-60.29	406.50	76.77	1.64			-684.43	.180
	(2.65)	(131.48)	(20.52)	(20.97)	(2.63)	(0.07)				
4b. Female earnings	0.90	-133.56	17.49	181.46	32.10	2.30			-2787.24	.385
	(1.47)	(74.59)	(11.69)	(14.49)	(1.63)	(0.04)				
5a. Male earnings	25.68	-501.54	-85.19	559.49	66.49	1.39	472.23	-7.51	-7274.95	.227
	(2.59)	(128.73)	(19.95)	(22.12)	(2.58)	(0.07)	(15.53)	(0.31)		
5b. Female earnings	1.54	-207.18	15.79	213.13	31.64	2.28	37.92	-0.44	-3628.96	.389
	(1.47)	(75.13)	(11.66)	(15.20)	(1.63)	(0.04)	(8.68)	(0.19)		

(continued)

Table 8 (continued)

Population and Dependent Variable	Independent Variables[a]								α	R^2
	FAOCC	FARM	SIBS	EDUC	OCC	TIME	EXPER	DECAY		
	Standardized Coefficients									
6a. Male earnings	.164	-.046	-.102							
6b. Female earnings	.078	-.008	-.048							
7a. Male earnings	.079	-.009	-.032	.289						
7b. Female earnings	-.008	.000	.007	.280						
8a. Male earnings	.050	-.005	-.024	.171	.239					
8b. Female earnings	-.030	.006	.026	.138	.276					
9a. Male earnings	.053	-.014	-.020	.160	.226	.146				
9b. Female earnings	.006	-.016	.013	.127	.194	.516				
10a. Male earnings	.072	-.027	-.029	.220	.196	.124	.754	-.603		
10b. Female earnings	.010	-.025	.012	.149	.191	.510	.130	-.067		

[a]Variables defined in Table 2.

[b]Standard errors in parentheses.

[c]Earnings in 1972 dollars.

been different for men and women. The ratio of female to male mean earnings has declined from 0.392 to 0.378 during this time,[4] and the changes in the sex-specific processes of economic achievement, together with the shifts in means among the model variables, have reduced the "discrimination" component of the sex differential from 85 percent ($4100) to 8[illegible] percent ($5825).

Neither for men nor for women do the reduced-form equations incorporating family factors (equations 1a and 1b in Tables 7 and 8) account for much variation in earnings, and there is some indication that family variables are even less associated with men's achievements in 1973 (R^2 = .058) than in 1962 (R^2 = .097). For both sexes in both years, the relative impact of paternal SEI is the largest of the three regressors (standardized coefficients), and this factor is the only family variable to be consistently significant statistically for women in both years. Among the metric coefficients for family background the values for men are appreciably higher than those for women, but between 1962 and 1973, the total effect of farm origin on earnings has decreased about 30 percent for men and 88 percent for women while that of sibship size has increased 54 percent for men and 207 percent for women.

When we take educational attainment into account in addition to the block of family factors, the total effects of the latter are greatly reduced. In 1973, the net effects of family are not significant among equally educated women, and for men somewhat larger proportions of the total family effects are transmitted indirectly through schooling than in 1962. For both sexes, the total effect of education increases over the period--by 48 percent for men and 68

percent for women, and the female-to-male ratio of these effects increases from 0.48 to 0.54, indicating both an absolute and relative improvement in women's returns to education over the decade. (Apparently the net negative effect of farm background is less consequential in 1973 among both men and women of equal schooling than it was in 1962. The diminution of the former direct effect of this "ascriptive" characteristic is tempered by the tendency of persons with it to spend greater hours at work at both survey dates; when TIME and occupation are controlled, farm origins again has a significant negative coefficient. Compare equations 4a and 4b with 2a and 2b in Tables 7 and 8.)

A greater proportion of education's effect on earnings is associated with the occupational attainments of women than of men. For example, the metric causal effect of education declines 41 percent and 51 percent for husbands and wives, respectively, when controlling for 1973 occupational SEI. In 1962, where farm origins has a negative net coefficient for both sexes, rendering persons equivalent on occupational status further reduces the force of this handicap of family background while leaving it significant statistically. In both years, the net effect of paternal SEI on men's earnings is significant, even if of minor substantive bearing, after controlling for their own occupations and education. The direct effect of occupational attainment is larger for men than for women in both years, and the female-to-male ratio decreases (from 0.76 to 0.56) as the total causal effect for men increases (from $61.12 to $80.97 per unit of the occupational SEI) while that for women does not.

In equations 8a and 8b of Tables 7 and 8 we note that the standardized effects of occupation are larger than those for education for both sexes in 1973, while the relative effect of education among women in 1962 is not much different than the rather inconsequential influence of family factors. This is consistent with our observation that the wages and salaries of women have become more responsive to their schooling differentials in the recent past. Moreover, while it is true that the sexes enjoy different returns to their various stocks of human resources, the variation in earnings is somewhat more comparably responsive to the linear combination of these resources in 1973 than in 1962 (compare R^2 = .203 for men and R^2 = .110 for women in 1962 with corresponding values of .159 and .126 in 1973). Finally, the changes in the patterns of relative effects over the decade suggest that the processes of economic achievement of the sexes may be becoming more similar (on this model).

Such speculation may be vacuous, inasmuch as returns to men's and women's occupations and educations are not strictly comparable unless the sex differentials in time at work in the reference year for annual earnings are controlled. As one might expect, hours at work in the year prior to the surveys (TIME in mneumonics) hardly alter the pattern of regression coefficients for men (compare, for example, equations 4a and 3a in Table 7) or add to variance in earnings explained. For women, however, TIME increases R^2 by 12 percent in 1962 and by 26 percent in 1973. In fact, some 38.5 percent of variation in women's 1973 earnings is explained by the model in equation 4b of Table 8; the corresponding value for men is 18 percent. (The exception

to our assertions about men and TIME is the effect of farm origin, which in 1973 becomes increasingly negative, though not significantly so.) Per hour returns are somewhat greater for women than for men, but less so in 1973 than in 1962 despite a small rise in the TIME coefficient. Perhaps more important is the observation that women's dollar returns to each unit of schooling and occupational SEI are still lower than men's among persons equal on TIME. The relevant ratios for 1962 are 0.29 for education and 0.62 for occupation, while the corresponding 1973 ratios are 0.45 and 0.42. Again, the differential returns to education have declined while those for occupation have increased.

The previously discussed shift for women in the pattern of relative (standardized) effects is unaltered by the control for TIME. Between 1962 and 1973, the comparative effect of a woman's education on her earnings increases vis-à-vis the influences of her ascriptive (family) characteristics. Discounting the relatively more dominant influence of TIME among the determinants of women's earnings than among men's, the patterns of relative effects for men and for women are more comparable in 1973 than in 1962, among persons with equal current labor force participation. Still, large differentials in the process of economic attainment persist even while some increase (occupational component) and others decrease (educational component).

As an aside, we note that the earnings benefit of an additional year of schooling has <u>increased</u> from $279 to $406 (46 percent) and from $81 to $181 (124 percent) for husbands and wives, respectively, in the ECLF populations of 1973 versus those of 1962. These increases

are adjusted for the occupational, family factors, and TIME differences in the respective populations. Again, we find little support for the conclusions of the "Newman Report" (cf. Task Force to the Secretary of HEW, 1974) that education has become less consequential for socioeconomic achievement in the recent past. More central to the topic of this paper is the observation that over the same period, the increase in the net return to a unit of occupational attainment (31 percent) has been confined to men (compare equations 4a in Tables 7 and 8 with equations 4b in the same tables).

Beyond hours of work during the year for which earnings is estimated, the literature on human capital formation cited above alerts us to other factors in the work experience of persons that differentiate them with respect to earnings potential. Age-earnings profiles are concave from the bottom, connoting the large investments in one's capital stock earlier in the life cycle rather than later, and denoting substantial rises in the earnings of persons in the early work career as a function of these investments and declines in the preretirement years owing to capital obsolescence, fewer incentives to retrain, and the decay of workers' physical and mental capacities. Earlier research by one of us using the 1962 data (Hauser, 1973) demonstrates the utility of employing a measure of work experience in the postschooling life cycle along with the square of this experience measure to assess the quadratic form of the age-earnings profile. When both EXPERIENCE and DECAY are entered into the same equation, we expect the latter age function to take on a negative sign. Furthermore, since the actual work experience of married women is likely to be

more discontinuous than that of men, we regard these age proxies as less valid for women. Also, insofar as wives out of the labor force for extended periods owing to family building suffer a depreciation of their accumulated experience that is less characteristic of the work cycles of men, we anticipate that the coefficients for EXPERIENCE and DECAY will be attenuated among women.

In our final set of earnings equations we add the two age-related experience regressors to functions containing occupational status, education, family background, and time in the labor force in the years prior to the surveys. As anticipated, these two factors add nothing to the explained variance in women's earnings, although in both years the coefficients for EXPERIENCE and DECAY are statistically significant. The net metric coefficients for women are in the expected direction, and each is smaller than the corresponding value for men in each year. Only the positive coefficient for women's EXPERIENCE is substantively interesting, and the 1973 net annual earnings of wives is lower (51 percent) for each year of postschooling experience than in 1962.

For men, the addition of the age-related regressors to the earnings function increments the explained variance by 3 percent in 1962 (R^2 = .23) and by 5 percent in 1973 (R^2 = .23). A year of experience nets a man $235 in 1962 but $472 in 1973. These values are, respectively, 3 and 12 1/2 times the earnings benefit to a year's additional postschooling experience for females. Controlling statistically for EXPERIENCE and DECAY increases husband's positive net return to schooling by 19 percent in 1962 and 38 percent in 1973, and the dollar handicap of farm origins increases by 36 percent in 1962 and by 90

percent in 1973. (A similar pattern appears among wives.) Inasmuch as persons of farm origin have less schooling and more experience at work than those of nonfarm origin, the increased and significantly negative effects of farm origin on men's (and women's) 1961 and 1972 earnings are explicable. What is striking is the absolute (metric) size of the net deficits ($501 in 1972 and $873 in 1961, a decline of 43 percent; for women the decline is 69 percent). When the earnings returns to education are controlled for the two age-related, postschooling experience factors, the ratios of the female to male education coefficients are 0.25 in 1962 and 0.38 in 1973 (compare with ratios of 0.48 and 0.54, respectively, in Tables 7 and 8; based on equations 2a and 2b). Similarly the ratios of net returns to occupational status are 0.66 in 1962 and 0.48 in 1973. Neither intensiveness of current labor force attachment (TIME) nor age-related experience factors (EXPER, DECAY) account for the differential returns to men's and women's educational and occupational attainments.

The full models in Tables 7 and 8 (equations 5a, 5b, 10a, 10b) amply document the different processes by which the earnings of husbands and wives are generated. When in standard form, the major factors for men are the countervailing effects of the accumulation of occupational experience and the deterioration of capacity, both associated with aging. Education and occupation and then hours at work last year follow in order of relative importance in both 1962 and 1973. Family origins play a rather minor role in the determination of annual wages and salaries among husbands, but in absolute terms the three family factors have significant effects even among men of equal age, schooling, and occupational status.

Among women, family background has no appreciable bearing on earnings, except for the "cost" of farm origins ($665 in 1962 and $207 in 1973). In relative terms the influence on earnings of one standard deviation change in a woman's education in 1962 is about the same as the farm origin deficit. In 1973, the net metric return to an additional year of schooling for a woman has improved (by 157 percent to $213), and the relative impact of education among standardized regressors is roughly equal to the effects of occupation and experience on earnings. At both survey dates, time in the labor force is the dominating relative influence on women's earnings.

We set aside TIME and the age-related experience factors that seem to interact with sex but whose effects are of doubtful interpretation (especially for women). After controlling men's and women's earnings for these factors in both years, we note that changes in the metric effects of occupation and education have been different for men and women. The ratio of female to male net returns to education is 0.25 in 1962 and 0.38 in 1973. The ratio of female to male net returns to occupational status in the full model is 0.66 in 1962 and 0.48 in 1973. Despite the apparent equality of opportunity for educational and occupational status between the sexes, women in the ECLF continue to be unable to convert these resources into economic returns at the same rate as men.

On balance, has inequality of economic opportunity by sex increased or decreased since 1962? By applying the 1962 and 1973 female means to the male regression equations in Tables 7 and 8, we standardize the rates of return and examine the effects of differential composition

of the sexes on the earnings gap. By proceeding in a step-wise fashion from equation 1a to 2a to 3a to 5a, we can decompose the gap into proportions attributable to sex differentials in family factors, schooling, occupation, time, and age-related factors taken together, and a residual component that we call inequality of opportunity or discrimination (see Duncan, 1969; Suter and Miller, 1973; Hauser and Featherman, 1974). The earnings gap for husbands and wives in the ECLF in 1962 was $4815, of which 85 percent or $4100 represents discrimination. In 1973, the gap is $6942, of which 83.9 percent or $5825 represents inequality of opportunity. This result should not be surprising, given the virtually equal composition of the sexes with respect to family factors, education, and occupational status. The only appreciable compositional difference is associated with work experience and time in the labor force, and this combined component accounts for the same proportion of the total gap in 1973 (18.8 percent) as in 1962 (18.9 percent). (Other components account for trivial and usually negative portions of the gap, owing to the modestly higher female than male means.) Hence, had women actually experienced the same rates of return to their human resources and social statuses as did men in 1962 and 1973, the absolute earnings gap would have been hardly reduced, assuming our full earnings model captures the broad range of important causal effects. The major source of the inequality is associated with the differential intercepts of the men's and women's earnings equations. Either because of their sex or for reasons excluded from our regression analysis, the level of wages and salaries allocated to women in the ECLF is systematically

lower than that of men. Women have not experienced equality of economic opportunity, and the 1973 data indicate only a minute diminution in this inequality.

Conclusions

Intercohort shifts in mean education, occupational status, and earnings for married persons in the experienced civilian labor forces of 1962 and 1973 represent socioeconomic improvements for both men and women. While the occupational and educational achievements of women have kept pace with men's and indeed exceed the male means, the ratio of female to male earnings has declined from 0.39 to 0.38 for husbands and wives in the ECLF. On rather rudimentary causal models of the processes of socioeconomic achievement, men and women are allocated to levels of education and occupational status in much the same manner. Women's achievements are somewhat less related to the characteristics of their families of origin, especially farm origin, than are men's attainments, and the net effect of educational attainment on occupational status is larger for wives than for their husbands. Intercohort changes in the process of occupational achievement have affected both sexes and include an increase in the net occupational status benefit of an additional year of schooling and a decline in the occupational handicap of farm origins.

Equality of economic opportunity for women has not followed from women's opportunities for schooling and occupational status. The process of earnings attainment is sharply different for the sexes, with men deriving greater benefits from their family origins, educations,

and occupational standings, even among persons of statistically equivalent work experience and levels of current labor force participation. While the net returns to education have improved more noticeably for women than men between 1962 and 1973, the intertemporal increases in returns to occupational status have benefited only men. In both decades, had women enjoyed the same rates of return to their stocks of human capital as had men, the sexual gap in earnings would not have been reduced appreciably, since the differential reflects "discrimination" more than the compositional differences between the sexes. Discrimination accounts for 85 percent of the earnings gap in 1962 and 84 percent in 1973. Despite these inequalities, the process of economic attainment is even less tied to person's social background (especially farm origins) in 1973 than a decade earlier, and the earnings returns to education are larger for both sexes. We find no support for popular notions of a declining socioeconomic importance of schooling.

Proponents of the view that the U.S. is moving toward a meritocratic, "post-industrial" era (for example, Bell, 1973) in which technical skills and formal education are prerequisite to advancement in the economic system may find the increases in the occupational and economic returns to schooling to be congenial to their perspective. Critics (such as Berg, 1970) of the (alleged) overemphasis of "credentialism" in the meritocratic, postindustrial society may see only their darkest suspicions being sustained. To that debate we can add very little except to note two points in closing. First, the increased returns to schooling for men and women have accompanied

decreases in the role of social origins on occupational status and earnings, a pattern consistent with the notion that change is in the direction of the "meritocracy."[5] Second, at least with respect to occupations and earnings (and especially among men), education, in conjunction with family factors, is no more and perhaps less able to account for variations in achievement in 1973 than in 1962. Were "credentialism" an increasingly important component of status allocation processes, we might expect both the net regression coefficients for education effects to be larger for 1973 than 1962 and the R^2 values to be higher as well. Since we do not observe the latter (except for women's earnings), we might conclude (provisionally) that the relative bearing of education versus family factors has shifted more toward "universalism," while the allocative processes themselves are, in the main, no more deterministic than in the last decade. Obviously, more detailed analyses of change are in order before confidence may be established in these ideas.

NOTES

[1]We are aware that socioeconomic scores derived for the U.S. male population may not be fully appropriate for women (Heyns and Gray, 1973). On the other hand, in comparative analyses the decision to calculate differential socioeconomic scores by gender adjusts for the very sorts of inequality one wants to detect in the data. To illustrate, one could follow Heyns and Gray and estimate separate regression equations by sex, relating prestige scores of occupations to both the educational and income characteristics of detailed titles. One would find a lower metric coefficient for the effect of female income on prestige than for men, reflecting the fact of fewer net income differentials among female incumbants of occupations. Upon calculating two sets of socioeconomic scores for the same set of occupation titles, the analyst computes regressions to assess, for example, differential income returns to occupational status. But having already adjusted "status" to reflect differences in aggregate income characteristics by sex, one finds less evidence of unequal pay for "equal" work among women vis-à-vis men.

At a more conceptual level, we regard occupational socioeconomic status to be a characteristic of a role, unaffected by characteristics of the role incumbant. Elsewhere we and others have distinguished between occupational "prestige" as the basis for deference/derogation (Goldthorpe and Hope, 1972) and prestige as occupational "desirability" in a socioeconomic sense (Featherman, Jones, and Hauser, 1974). Insofar as occupational prestige and socioeconomic scales scale the "desirable" aspects of jobs and occupation roles, their values should be relatively unaffected by the characteristics of incumbants, including their gender. If prestige scales really tapped the classical concept intended by Weber and others (cf. Goldthorpe and Hope, 1974, for some British evidence on this matter), then one might want to use elements about incumbants in calculating (nonconstant) status scores for occupations.

Other arguments for using a common scale for comparative studies of men's and women's occupational attainments appear in Treiman and Terrell (1975).

The classification and accompanying SEI scores used to scale current occupation are appended.

[2]Variations around the respective means of schooling are unequal for men and women in both years. Therefore the more informative statistics for sexual comparisons are the *raw* or metric ones rather than the standardized or <u>beta</u> coefficients. As an aside, we note a decline in the education variances (educational inequality) for both husbands and wives between 1962 and 1973.

[3]The standard deviation around the women's occupational SEI mean is smaller than men's in both years, although the differences are small. One can argue that women are excluded from both the lowest and the highest status occupations and enjoy fewer occupational alternatives. Alternatively, we might say that wives, as "secondary" workers, have more opportunity to choose whether or not to be in the labor force as a function of "tastes" and abilities to find "interesting" or "appropriate" work. Our data do not permit us to assay these and other alternative explanations. However, the steeper slope to the (net) relationship between wive's SEI and education than that among husbands is consistent with the notion that married women are selected into the ECLF (comparatively) more frequently on their success in matching education to the requirements of their (prospective) jobs (cf. Sweet, 1973: 130-132 for some data pertinent to these issues).

[4]It may seem inappropriate to compare the gross earnings of men with those of women, as the women (even in the ECLF) work part-time or part year to a greater extent than do the men. Still, that observation is part of the unequal or differentiated roles of the sexes. The noted trend in the female-to-male ratio over the period is consistent with census reports on earnings for full-time male and female workers between 1960 and 1974 (McNeil and Sater, 1975).

[5]There is an overlap in the coverage of birth cohorts between the two surveys. Persons born between 1909 and 1942 are represented in both 1962 and 1973. Given this rather extensive overlap, it is rather noteworthy that we find any changes in the allocative processes examined in this paper. Later work will attempt age-constant inter-cohort analyses, together with intracohort analyses.

REFERENCES

Alexander, K., and B. K. Eckland. "Sex Differences in the Educational Attainment Process." American Sociological Review 39 (October 1974): 668-82.

Bell, D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Berg, I. Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. New York: Praeger, 1970.

Blau, P. M., and O. D. Duncan. The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Carter, N. "The Effects of Sex and Marital Status on a Social-Psychological Model of Occupational Status Attainment." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1972.

DeJong, P.; M. Brawer; and S. Robin. "Patterns of Female Intergenerational Mobility: A Comparison with Male Patterns of Intergenerational Occupational Mobility." American Sociological Review 36 (December 1971): 1033-42.

Duncan, O. D. "A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations." In Occupations and Social Status, by A. Reiss, pp. 139-61. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Duncan, O. D. "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?" In On Understanding Poverty, edited by D. Moynihan, pp. 85-110. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Featherman, D. L., and R. M. Hauser. "Trends in Occupational Mobility by Race and Sex in the United States, 1962-1972." Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper 239-74. Madison, Wis.: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974.

Featherman, D. L., and R. M. Hauser. "Design for a Replicate Study of Social Mobility in the United States." In Social Indicator Models, edited by K. Land and S. Spilerman, pp. 219-52. New York: Russell Sage, 1975.

Featherman, D. L., F. L. Jones; and R. M. Hauser. "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status." Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper 213-74. Madison, Wis.: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974.

Fuchs, V. "Differentials in Hourly Earnings by Region and City Size." Occasional Paper No. 101. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1967.

Goldthorpe, J., and K. Hope. "Occupational Grading and Occupational Prestige." In The Analysis of Social Mobility: Methods and Approaches, edited by K. Hope, pp. 19-79. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Goldthorpe, J., and K. Hope. The Social Grading of Occupations: A New Approach and Scale. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Haller, A. O., and Portes, A. "Status Attainment Processes." Sociology of Education 46 (Winter 1973): 51-91.

Haller, A. O., and W. H. Sewell. "Occupational Choices of Wisconsin Farm Boys." Rural Sociology 32 (March 1967): 37-55.

Haller, A. O., and C. Wolff. "Personality Orientations of Farm, Village, and Urban Boys." Rural Sociology 27 (September 1962): 275-93.

Hauser, R. M. "Socioeconomic Background and Differential Returns to Education." In Does College Matter?, edited by L. C. Solmon and P. J. Taubman, pp. 129-45. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Hauser, R. M., and D. L. Featherman. "Socioeconomic Achievements of U.S. Men, 1962 to 1972." Science 185 (July 1974): 325-31.

Hauser, R. M.; D. L. Featherman; and D. Hogan. "Race and Sex in the Structure of Occupational Mobility in the U.S., 1962." Unpublished Working Paper (#74-26). Madison, Wis.: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974.

Havens, E., and J. Tully. "Female Intergenerational Occupational Mobility: Comparisons of Patterns?" American Sociological Review 37 (December 1972): 1033-42.

Heyns, B., and J. Gray. "A Socioeconomic Index for Women's Occupations." Unpublished paper. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard University, 1973.

McNeil, J., and D. Sater. "Recent Changes in Female to Male Earnings Ratios." Paper presented at Population Association of America meetings, Seattle, Washington, 1975.

Mincer, J. Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1974.

Mincer, J., and S. Polachek. "Family Investments in Human Capital." Journal of Political Economy 82 (1974): S-76-S108.

Nilson, L. "The Occupational and Sex Related Components of Social Standing." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1974.

Rogoff, N. R. "Patterns of Female Intergenerational Occupational Mobility: A Comment." American Sociological Review 38 (December 1973): 806-7.

Rossi, P.; W. Sampson; C. Bose; G. Jasso; and J. Passel. "Measuring Household Social Standing." Social Science Research 3 (September 1974): 169-90.

Sewell, W. H.; A. O. Haller; and G. Ohlendorf. "The Educational and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision." American Sociological Review 35 (December 1970): 1014-27.

Sheehy, L. "A Model of Educational and Occupational Attainment for Female Labor Force Participants." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1975.

Suter, L., and H. Miller. "Income Differences Between Men and Career Women." American Journal of Sociology 78 (January 1973): 962-74.

Sweet, J. Women in the Labor Force. New York: Seminar, 1973.

Task Force to the Secretary of H.E.W. The Second Newman Report: National Policy and Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974.

Treiman, D. J., and K. Terrell. "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of Working Women and Men." American Sociological Review 40 (April 1975): 174-200.

Tyree, A., and J. Treas. "The Occupational and Marital Mobility of Women." American Sociological Review 39 (June 1974): 293-302.

U.S. Department of Labor. Dual Careers. Vol. 1. Manpower Research Monograph No. 21. Washington, D.C., 1970.

Wang, L. "The Female Status Attainment Process and Occupational Mobility." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1973.

APPENDIX

Classification for Current Occupation and Duncan SEI Recodes

Engineers	83.8
Medical, salaried Medical, self-employed	59.3
Teachers, exc. college	72.0
Other professional, salaried Other professional, self-employed	75.4
MOP, salaried	68.0
MOP, self-employed, retail, other	47.0
Stenographer	61.0
Other clerical	45.2
Sales, retail	39.0
Sales, other	66.0
Construction, carpenters Construction, other	30.5
Foremen	47.6
Machinists	32.6
Mechanics, auto Mechanics, other	26.0
Metal crafts	27.4
Other crafts	39.6
Operatives, non-mfg. (drivers, mine workers, non-mfg. industries)	19.0
Operatives, mfg. (motor vehicle mfg., nondurable goods, other durables)	17.0
Nonfarm labor, construction Nonfarm labor, other	7.0
Nonfarm labor, mfg.	8.0
Private household	8.0
Other service	17.0
Farm and farm mgr.	14.0
Farm laborers, foremen	9.0